ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 7/16/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED002003	N.A.	N.A.

4. AUTHOR(S):
N.A.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Teacher Education for Human Relations in the Classroom: A Report from 1108 College Professors

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
N.A.

7. EDITOR(S):
N.A.

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	26

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. North Central Assn. of Colleges and Secondary Schools
ST. 5454 South Shore Dr.
CITY, STATE Chicago 15, Illinois
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☒ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
Report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

colleges				
human relations	teaching techniques			
teacher education	administration, college			
teacher attitudes				

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools surveyed their member colleges to find what attitudes prevailed and what educational opportunities were offered in the area of human relations.

Although there is a large amount of agreement among the respondents that information about and understanding of human relations in general are important, about half are not sure of their importance for both the full personal or professional development of the individual. Considerably less emphasis is given to the problem of intergroup relations than interpersonal relations. Most of the respondents avoided controversial topics in their courses.

Because of the results of this study the committee felt that administrators should challenge their faculties to consider the questions of teaching intergroup relations. The pooling of information about the college courses should reveal omissions. Investigations of student attitudes and of values in human relations should be conducted. To complete the campus self-evaluation, textbooks, materials, activities, and organizations should be considered in light of effectiveness in developing human relations.

Good practices used in various colleges and universities for developing human relations skills are faculty conferences, student seminars, a human relations center, summer workshops, and field experiences for preservice teachers.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

PROGRAMS IN INTERGROUP RELATIONS
FOR SCHOOL PERSONNEL

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION

TEACHER EDUCATION FOR HUMAN RELATIONS IN THE CLASSROOM

002003

Office of Education-EEOP
Research and Materials Branch

A report from 1108 college professors

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Study Conducted by
Subcommittee on Human Relations
in the Classroom

Teacher Education Committee of
Commission on Research
and Service

North Central Association of
Colleges and Secondary Schools

With Assistance From
Anti-Defamation League of
B'nai B'rith

BLANK PAGE

Teacher Education for Human Relations in the Classroom

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RELATIONS
IN THE CLASSROOM
COMMITTEE ON TEACHER EDUCATION
COMMISSION ON RESEARCH AND SERVICE

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Office of Education-EEOP
Research and Materials Branch

FOREWORD

THIS MONOGRAPH is a report of the first study of the Committee on Human Relations in the Classroom, a sub-committee of the Teacher Education Committee of the Commission on Research and Service of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Many persons have had important parts in its preparation, among them Bert Greene, Donald Halsted, and Harold Organic, all graduate assistants at the University of Michigan. The Committee is indebted to Dr. T. Harry Broad who gave the charge to the Committee, and to the many persons in official or staff positions in the North Central Association, including Presidents Broad, Ross, and Romine. Here sincere thanks are expressed to the 1,108 college professors who responded to our inquiry and to the 223 North Central Association colleges in which they were located.

Special mention is made of Eastern Michigan University, of the Institute of Social Research of the University of Michigan, and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith without whose fund raising efforts the carrying out of the study would not have been possible. The consultative and editorial assistance of Gertrude Noar, National Director of Education of the Anti-Defamation League, has been invaluable.

Since its organization in 1957 the Committee has felt an increasing awareness of the urgency of its assignment, a feeling created by the multiplying difficulties in human relations in world affairs today.

A second study reporting the experiences of second-year teachers with problems of human relations will be ready soon.

Respectfully submitted,

F. C. ROSECRANCE, Dean, College of Education,
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan (Chairman)

GEORGE F. BROCK, Principal, West Senior High School,
Aurora, Illinois

ROBERT S. FOX, Director, University School,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

RONALD LIPPITT, Professor of Psychology and Sociology,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

CATHERINE VAN VLECK, Girls' Counselor,
Daniel Webster High School, Tulsa, Oklahoma

Teacher Education for Human Relations in the Classroom

PREFACE

The Committee on Human Relations in the Classroom, of the NCA, respectfully submits this report on the first of several projects it undertook in fulfillment of its responsibility to study teacher education with respect to human relations. The report is directed to the attention of all those responsible for and involved in the education of teachers: administrators, deans, professors and those responsible for certifying and hiring teachers.

There has been much discussion of teacher education institutions. Critics have leveled at the courses on methods and philosophy. So-called "educationists" have been blamed for producing confused and inadequate classroom teachers.

Many of those who think that classroom teachers and teaching are weak, believe that strength will come from increasing the requirements in subject matter courses. But more background information alone will not improve classroom instruction. A person who is an authority in his field may still be unable to impart his information to secondary school students, or he may be so inept in dealing with problems of relationships that his classroom becomes a chaotic place in which little learning can take place.

Research in human growth and development leaves no doubt that good relationships in the home, community and school are requisites in the full development of potentialities. Without them a pupil suffers from feelings of rejection, and may come to believe that he himself is unlovable. Resultant frustration, distorted self-concept and anxiety, in all likelihood, will block learning and defeat the purposes of the teacher. When all the negative attitudes and disadvantages that surround minority group children are added, results for them and for society may be even more disastrous.

All of this adds up to the necessity for seeing to it that before they enter the classroom, teachers have full opportunity in their pre-service college courses to develop the understandings, attitudes, values and skills in all the areas of human relations that impinge upon the classroom. This project was undertaken in order to discover present practices in teacher preparation with respect to human relations. From this clearer knowledge of what is (or is not) being done, it is hoped the profession will be in a better position to act toward improving the preparation of teachers to deal effectively with the challenges and opportunities involved in human relations in the classroom.

Rationale

American education from kindergarten through the graduate school of the university has always been subject to scrutiny and criticism. The public school has responded by changing its program to meet more fully the needs and demands of the nation and of the locality which directly controls the school. Thus the curriculum has grown from reading, writing and ciphering to the complexity of the modern comprehensive senior high school.

For the past several years, in response to fears and anxieties growing out of the struggle to maintain world leadership, there has been a demand that the schools improve and increase their offerings in mathematics, science and foreign language. The resulting emphasis placed on these subjects in the nation has tended to draw time and attention away from the social studies, language arts and fine arts, areas deeply concerned with people and their relationships. Moreover, the renewed interest in factual information per se, together with the prediction that machines will teach facts more efficiently than the human teacher can do, may further decrease the likelihood of giving pupils those experiences in the group and with a teacher, from which values and skills of human relationships are learned.

While momentarily schools are moving to satisfy the specific demands with respect to subject matter, educators responsible for the preparation of teachers are looking more deeply into the problems of people and of learning. They are examining the roles the teacher is expected to perform. They also see the explosion of knowledge in all subject areas, and while they recognize the importance of specialization, they also know that there are additional essentials that all teachers should possess. Some are becoming aware of the necessity for having classroom teachers who understand and have the skills essential to create and interpret life's basic interpersonal and intergroup relationships for themselves and their pupils.

Conflict relationships between individuals and groups are basic to some of the most serious issues confronting our society. They take many forms. In the close association of family life, for example, people do not know how to relate well enough to avoid marital discord and divorce. Tension, anxiety and even violence are familiar factors in American homes. In the areas of industry, business and the professions, the war between the sexes results in discrimination and waste of human resources. In the home, in the school and in the community, the conflict of youth and adults, the conflict between the generations—youth and adult pitted against each other, is seen to be a primary cause of delinquency. In the home and in the school, many parents and teachers do not know how to establish the warm positive relations with *all* children that are necessary to prevent frustration and anxiety, both of which block learning and can cause bad behavior. Nor do all teachers have the skills of preventing and resolving conflict in and among the peer groups. The tensions and conflicts between the racial and sub-culture groups which constitute American society, are reflected in the school, one of whose responsibilities is to develop in people the ability not only to accept but to value human differences.

Surveys of youth, of teachers and of adults in the school and community show that too many people do not know and understand the Bill of Rights. Nor are they sufficiently committed to it to live accordingly, to be willing to grant those rights to all within the nation, and to assist in spreading the practice of democracy around the world. Intergroup conflict in the nation is concerned with discrimination in housing, employment, education and social life, based on race, religion, ethnic origin and social class, and it continues to prevent large numbers of people from realizing their full potentialities.

The year 1960 lighted up the dangers arising from interreligious hatreds and con-

flicts. Through January and February, hundreds of anti-Semitic desecrations were perpetrated by adolescents, most of whom were attending high schools. In the fall, the presidential election campaign revealed the intensity of anti-Catholic prejudice in sections of the country.

If the nation is to move toward solution of these problems of interpersonal, intergroup and international relations, the pupils now in the schools and the teachers now being prepared in the colleges must be informed about them, must learn the skills needed to handle and resolve tension and conflict, must develop positive attitudes toward difference, and must realign their value systems and behaviors in terms of the democratic philosophy and the Judeo-Christian ethic.

The classroom of the public school is the place, the only one for most, in which a great variety of children have the chance to meet, to work and play together, to learn that differences of race, religion, nationality, money and even mental ability are not valid reasons for rejection. There the teacher plays a unique and strategic role, a role that no other adult is called upon to play. When the occasion arises, he must stand between individuals and groups as they struggle with each other. He, with a foot in each camp, must be the mediator, having and teaching children to have more than one loyalty. This kind of opportunity and experience occurs to the teacher and the pupil in the public school. The clergyman has the opportunity to fill the role of mediator only when he deliberately seeks interfaith experiences. The social worker does not have such opportunity, since he is required to be on the side of one person, one family or one social group as he deals with them. Only the teacher legitimately can and must be impartial. This role of mediator is difficult for teachers who, for the most part, fear conflict in any form.

Those who are responsible for both pre- and in-service education of teachers must take into account the information, skills, attitudes and values that teachers require for today and tommorrow. Both now and then, international differences, especially those which highlight race, are and will be crucial. The children now in school must get more information and develop more positive attitudes to live successfully or even to survive in the world in which there is no longer any "far." The non-white races constitute two-thirds of the world's peoples, and it is only one in seven who believes in the Judeo-Christian ethic. A "snail's pace" is no longer justifiable or even safe.

A Committee Was Created

In 1957, growing concern over the problems of human relations as related to education, and over the seeming neglect of them in the minds of people pressing for curriculum improvement, for more science, more mathematics and more foreign language, led the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools to lift the subject up for attention. The Association's Commission on Research and Service consequently appointed a sub-Committee on Human Relations in the Classroom. The charge given to that Committee by the President of the North Central Association was to come up with suggestions and recommendations to teacher education institutions as to what they could do to sensitize prospective teachers regarding problems of human relations which they will meet and with which they must be prepared to deal, in the classroom and in the community.

The Committee spent some time in exploring what is meant by this area of study. How the student sees himself and how he views the teacher were regarded as of significance to his all-around growth and his intellectual progress. If a student has an inadequate appraisal of himself, a negative self-concept, he is not likely to achieve his

full potential until it is adjusted. Moreover, the student is not likely to prosper intellectually or any other way if his relations with the teacher are unsatisfactory. Relationships among students in the classroom are also very important factors which either promote or inhibit learning. A student is not likely to learn much in a group in which he is afraid of his peers or is rejected by them. High morale and fine esprit de corps are important to high achieving. Current research has indicated that poor human relations in the classroom are a major barrier to effective individual learning. Unhappy classroom situations must be alleviated if the school is to develop the talents and skills of all the children of all the people, for all are needed in our society.

The Task

The Committee decided that first it must find out what teacher education institutions currently offer to meet the prospective teacher's personal and professional need for information, skills, attitudes and values in respect to human relations. Consequently, three major projects were planned:

1) Administration and interpretation of an extensive questionnaire to survey current practices in teacher education institutions, which are members of the North Central Association.

2) A survey of second year teachers, graduates of these institutions participating in the first project, to find out what human relations problems they met, how they handled them and how they perceived their college work as preparation for the task of dealing successfully with those problems.

3) Recommendation of activities for North Central Association member institutions, which will strengthen programs of pre- and in-service education in respect to the teaching of human relations.

This pamphlet reports the first project.

Pre-Service Education for Human Relations

The Committee believes that good human relations are essential to the creation of a good learning situation in a classroom. Such factors as intellectual level, socio-economic status, physical development, and racial, national and religious backgrounds must be understood by the teacher, Otherwise he is unlikely to create a good rapport and climate for learning on the part of his pupils.

In the light of this belief, it was then the purpose of the Committee to set up a project to discover what teacher education institutions were doing in their programs of education to prepare teachers in the area of human relations. The following outline of action was adopted: to contact by questionnaire each of the teacher training institutions in the nineteen-state area of the North Central Association and determine as nearly as posible their objectives, what emphasis was being given to training in human relations, in what college departments or courses, how the responding professors feel about the importance of the subject, how they help students to acquire the insights and experiences that make the various aspects of human relations come alive and whether or not they regard what is being done as sufficient.

As this report is read, it is important for the reader to remember that the North Central Association includes 19 states running from north to south through the center of the country. The participating colleges are located in all kinds of communities and reflect the complex life of large urban centers as well as the more simplified conditions of rural living. Those professors who agreed to participate may or may not be typical of the total faculty; may or may not give adequate pictures of the learning opportunities afforded by their departments. Moreover, the responding institutions varied in size as

measured by the number of the previous June's graduates. Nearly one-third of the replies came from colleges who graduate less than sixty teachers, whereas less than one-seventh came from institutions graduating from 300 to over 1,100.

Selection of Respondents

The questionnaire entitled, "A Study of Teacher Training in Human Relations," was sent with a letter over the signature of the President of the North Central Association, to an official in each of 336 member institutions. The official selected up to six professors whose subject areas were most closely concerned, and who were willing to participate in the study. They were instructed to select from among their courses the one most revelant to the content of the questionnaire and to answer the questions from the viewpoint of that course. Two hundred twenty-three institutions responded. Approximately 37% of them receive their support from public sources, and 58% are privately supported. Of the latter, 52% are affiliated with a religious denomination.

Responses came from 1,108 professors and instructors who were requested to reply by the president or dean of the institution. They were, therefore, a selected group and their replies, in all probability, gave the most favorable picture of what was being done in their institutions. Respondents represented several disciplines and all faculty ranks. For example, education departments were represented by 587 respondents; 150 were in economics, political science or history, and 112 were in sociology or anthropology. About 10% of them were instructors, 17% assistant professors, 30% associate professors, and 39% professors.

The Questionnaire

The survey instrument presented itemized lists of the relationships which pervade human life and the situations in which the problems of relationships occur. In the social setting of the community, the respondent was called upon to consider the information and understandings required for the individual to deal successfully with relationships among age groups and children of the same age, between parent and child, with respect to the expected role behavior of men and women, among people of different educational levels and among religious, racial, economic and nationality groups.

Within the setting of the school system, the courses were to be explored with respect to the information and understanding required by the teacher as he confronts and deals with himself, his supervisors, his colleagues and with his pupils and their parents.

In the context of the classroom, the respondent was asked to record what he does and his feelings about the information and understanding needed by the teacher to deal with relationships among pupils of different sexes, of varying levels of intellectual performance, of different socio-emotional and physical development, and among pupils of different religious, economic, racial and nationality backgrounds.

In the following pages this report will deal with some of the findings which make a few things clear, but raise many more questions and point the way for more research. The data gathered are not definitive. While the study is not complete, analysis of the data highlights some problems and gives some support to the general thesis that colleges do not give sufficient attention to the preparation of teachers to meet problems of human relations, particularly the problems of intergroup relations.

Study of the data, for example, reveals significant differences in two groups of relationships. Interpersonal, inter-age and inter-sex relations fall into one area of consideration. Into the other area go relationships that cross racial, religious, economic and nationality group lines. The former are of a less controversial nature with respect to education than the latter. On the whole they create less social tension with the possible

exception of the conflict between the generations, which bears a relationship to delinquency. In them, also, the individual's social prejudices, both instructor's and student's, are less involved.

Development of "attitudes, values and sensitivities" is most frequently accepted as a valid objective of the courses reported on than "content and information." "Skills and techniques" is mentioned less frequently.

From one-fourth to one-half of the respondents are unaware of omissions in the curriculum of teacher education for human relations, or say there are none.

The objectives of human relations education are believed to be accomplished, for the most part, through formal lecture and class discussion. Direct experience is used at best, by no more than one-third of the respondents.

In general, human relations, especially those involving controversial aspects such as race and religion, are not assigned to specific departments, courses and professors. This leads to the speculation that what is everyone's responsibility is frequently not considered in any course.

The above and other aspects of the study follow in greater detail.

Spread of Responsibility for Human Relations Education

Who teaches courses that are pertinent to education for human relations? Is this a status area or one allocated to the inexperienced instructor? Replies came from people on every professional level. Nearly half held administrative positions: department chariman, dean or supervisor of student teachers. As indicated earlier, a number of disciplines were represented: education, sociology, history, anthropology, psychology, political science and other social sciences. Just over half were in education and a little less than one-quarter were in the social sciences and anthropology.

Most of the full professors said that they do not treat the subject of human relations in their courses. The assistant professors indicate that they do so more frequently than any other group.

The data do not show whether or not a specific area of human relations is handled by a particular department. This is a question whose answer needs to be sought. The location of a sub-topic or issue may determine what the students learn about it and their attitudes towards it. For example, if race relations are taught in sociology but not in anthroplogy, or in social psychology and not in sociology, or in regard to individual differences and not with respect to motivation, a student's belief in the myth of racial superiority might go unchallenged. If, on the other hand, this subject is confined to the sciences and never approached in education, the student could be graduated with no understanding of its implications for the school and classroom. It is possible for several departments to treat such matters as informational items—facts soon to be forgotten. In such a situation a student may never envision their implication for his role as a teacher. This raises the question as to whether or not application to education is not a function of all departments in teacher education.

Objectives, Importance and Emphasis

Do college professors think human relations is important—if so, for what, for whom, when, and who is to teach it? The answer seems to be yes; the great majority believe the subject is important for either the personal or the professional development and life of the prospective teacher. However, a look at the data reveals a sharp break between what they say is important and what they actually do. For example, 77% say that information and understanding between age groups are important for both teaching and personal development, but only 38% give these relationships important emphasis

in the particular courses which they are describing. Whereas 55% agree that information and understanding of race relationships in the classroom are similarly important, only 20% give the subject important emphasis. From 17% to 33% (Table IV) give no emphasis to the many kinds of human relations in the classroom and school system. From 12% to 28% omit them in teaching about the community.

The questionnaire assumed that among the objectives of human relations education are developing and, where necessary, changing attitudes, values and sensitivities. More than 60% of the respondents accepted these as their own goals. Less than half agreed to the assumption that college professors aim to impart content and information about human relations. Development of skills and techniques of human relations was also indicated as an objective on the questionnaire. This was accepted by less than one-fourth of the respondents.

Degrees of importance are ordinarily assigned by a professor to the various objectives he wishes to accomplish. This determines his priorities. What aspects of human relations receive priority? The data (Table I) indicate that with the exception of attitudes and values regarded by more than 60% as important in all the areas of human relations, content information regarding race, religion, economic and nationality differences are regarded as not important by 58% (Table III). The fact that skills and techniques are given importance by only 13% seems to indicate that interaction, which requires skills, is neglected. According to the data (Table III), nearly half of the respondents aim to teach about boy-girl and parent-child relationships. Only 30% aim to teach skills in handling these relationships and more than 60% list developing attitudes and values with respect to sex, age and intellectual differences among their objectives. However, 20% do not cover the topics at all.

Emphasis

The importance attributed to any objective bears a relationship to the emphasis placed upon it in developing a course. Do the professors place emphasis on human relations in the degree of importance they assign to it? The data on this aspect of the problem are difficult to interpret. They show, in general, that there is some discrepancy between the importance attributed to human relations for both personal and professional development of teachers, and the emphasis given to these areas. However, the reader will note that among the respondents there certainly are some who agreed to the importance of the many aspects of human relations in all three settings, but whose courses have nothing at all to do with certain specific items which they nevertheless, and quite rightly, judged to be important.

An example of the differences between the emphasis and importance given by professors of education, to dealing with one of the controversial areas (race) as contrasted with one of the other areas (intellectual differences) can be found in Table VI.

Comfort can be derived from the fact that a large amount of agreement is expressed concerning the importance of human relations education in general. Only 6% indicate that they place no importance in teaching about relationships arising from nationality backgrounds. Only 4% see racial backgrounds, 3% economic backgrounds, and 5% religious backgrounds as unimportant areas of learning for both the personal and professional life of the student.

One aspect of the data should give concern. About 40% of the respondents see matters of understanding, information about, attitudes, values and skills with respect to racial, religious, economic and nationality backgrounds in the context of the classroom as unimportant for the personal development of the teacher.

When figures are combined for both importance and for emphases and these are inspected for differences with respect to the controversial areas, such as racial, religious,

economic and nationality group relations, as contrasted with the importance of emphases placed on the less sensitive areas such as relations between teacher and pupils and between intellectual levels, a considerable drop is noted with respect to the former areas.

	Highly Important	No Importance	Important Emphasis
Non-controversial areas	64%	1%	55%
Controversial areas	53%	7%	18%

Non-controversial areas are listed as of no importance by 1%, and highly important by 64%. The controversial items are considered unimportant by 7%, highly important by 53%. Non-controversial areas are given important emphasis by 55%. Important emphasis is placed on the controversial areas by only 18%.

Who Teaches What

Professors in all departments believed that their courses were relevant to the subject under investigation, since they agreed to participate in it. This means that information about human relations reaches the student from many sources. It could also mean that no one is responsible for integrating the learnings and for helping students to look at meanings and implications for their personal and professional lives.

A look at the data (Table V) on the emphasis placed on human relations by various departments provides some insight and raises more questions. More than half of the respondents (587) are in education. Eighty-four percent of them report at least "some" emphasis. This includes those who give important and moderate emphasis, but leaves 14% whose courses do not include human relations.

About 14% of the respondents teach psychology, sociology or anthropology. Seventy-one percent of them report at least some emphasis. This leaves 26% whose courses do not include human relations. In connection with this, the reader must also realize that in many institutions a student preparing to teach can be graduated without having had a course in sociology or anthropology. Of the remaining 150 respondents teaching other social sciences such as history, political science and social studies, 57% give at least some emphasis to human relations. Thirty-nine percent give none. Some respondents wrote comments about the questionnaire. Of significance in connection with the foregoing figures are such remarks as, "I teach *history*, not human relations."

When departmental replies are examined in greater detail with respect to both importance and emphasis, the figures are confusing and difficult to interpret because of the fact that emphasis in the one course being described cannot be said to reflect on what the professor regards as important in the total education of a teacher. However, it still remains clear (Table VI) that 20% of the respondents in education, 15% of the sociologists and anthropologists, and 37% of the others give no emphasis to teaching about *racial differences*. Also (Table VII) 48% of those in education, 9% of those in sociology and anthroplogy, 8% of those in psychology, and 33% of the others give no emphasis to *interreligious group relations* in the community setting. Yet a child's life and relationships outside of school have enormous implications for his relationships and experiences in the school.

When some over-all figures are examined, we see that (Table VIII) 82% of those in education rate the controversial areas as important for teaching and 73% give these at least some emphasis. On the other hand, 95% of them rate the less controversial areas important and 91% give them at least some emphasis. Psychologists, sociologists and

anthropologists emphasize the controversial areas more than do professors of education (85% on importance and 79% on emphasis), however, the positions are reversed with respect to the less controversial areas (90% and 77%).

It is to be expected that the objectives of professors in various departments will vary. Data show that those who teach sociology, psychology and anthroplogy are more interested in presenting *information* about human relations in the context of *community*, than are other professors. Those in education are more concerned than others in developing human relations *skills and attitudes* in the context of all three areas—community, school system and classroom.

Omissions

No one will disagree with the assumption that not any one department can meet all that the student neeeds for his personal and professional development. On the other hand, the assumption that the entire program of teacher education should do so, is justified. Examination of the data collected from the respondents indicates that many omissions exist with respect to conveying to prospective teachers sufficient information about human relations, creating positive attitudes and values and developing skills. The teacher education curriculum is unlikely to be changed unless those who are involved in teaching in it can see it as a whole and can come to agreements with respect to filling the holes which presently exist.

Do professors see that there are omissions? What reasons do they give for them? About one-third of all the respondents said they do not know whether or not there are omissions. Does this mean that these teachers have not examined their courses in the light of the problems discussed in the report?

Failure on the part of respondents to see omissions should give some concern to those responsible for improvement of teacher education. In the context of community and classroom fewer people said that there are no omissions with respect to teaching about relationships due to differences in racial, religious, economic and nationality backgrounds than in the less controversial areas. This would seem to indicate that over 80% of the respondents believe that somewhere else in the program, if not in their classes, these relationships are being clarified; that in someone else's classroom, or in theirs, the student is being confronted with the problems of prejudice and discrimination in our society; that at least one other professor, if not they themselves, is challenging students to correct prevalent stereotypes and the tendency toward stereotypic thinking about minority groups. The data previously disucussed do not seem to justify these assumptions.

Does the department in which a professor works bear a relationship to his feeling or knowledge about the total curriculum designed to prepare teachers? In other words, who, in a college, is most conscious of omissions in the program? According to the data (Table X) one-fourth of the professors of education say there are no omissions and another one-fourth say they do not know. Half of those who teach sociology, psychology and anthropology say they do not know and 11% say there are none. The lack of sensitivity or realization that the program for prospective teachers is weak in its provision for teaching about human relations is, in itself, significant and attention should be directed to it. Lack of awareness of omission is dangerous.

There is evidence in the data that more people said they "do not know" about omissions, when their own courses or activities were not required, than when their courses and activities were required.

Respondents who perceived omissions were asked to state what, in their minds, were the reasons for them. Four possible reasons were presented by the questionnaire: lack of adequate development of the required subject matter, lack of time, lack of special

training which they evidently deemed essential, and the assumption that someone else was covering the material. Every reason for omissions was checked by at least 6% of the respondents. No one reason was checked by more than 15% (Table IX). About one-seventh checked lack of subject matter, lack of time, or lack of special training as the reasons for omissions with respect to the more controversial issues of race, religion, nationality and economic group relations in the community setting. Nearly as many checked the same reasons for omissions of these relationships in the context of the classroom.

Methods

It is of interest to learn how teachers of teachers go about accomplishing their objectives. Consequently, questions about methods were inserted in the survey instrument. The following nine types of teaching-learning situations, in the order of frequency, were checked as being used by respondents (Table XI): class discussion (59%), formal lecture (42%), observation in the field (21%), conferences with students (20%), practice teaching (19%), preparation of papers (17%), small group work (15%), use of resource person (12%), and active field project (8%). Research on methods of changing negative attitudes indicates that contact-acquaintance across group lines is much more helpful than providing information by lecturing. The fact that so few professors provide students with opportunities for that kind of experience indicates a serious lack in the program which should give curriculum planners much concern.

Summary

The programs of pre-service education of teachers in the institutions which participated in this study include both required and elective courses in education, sociology, anthropology, social science, history and other relevant subjects. These courses are taught by professors of all professional ranks.

Although there is a large amount of agreement among the respondents that information about and understanding of human relations in general are important, about half are not sure of their importance for both the full personal *or* professional development of the individual. Moreover, there is variation of opinion with respect to the several aspects of the problem. While many professors seem to be interested in conveying information and understanding about relationships between age groups, the sexes and intelligence levels, fewer seem to see that teaching about the controversial subjects of race, religions, social class and nationality group relations are also important.

Belief that information, understanding, positive attitudes, values and skills of human relations among age groups, the sexes, intelligence levels, races, religions, ethnic and socio-economic groups in the community, school and classroom are important does not always result in a professor's listing them among his objectives. As a result, many professors do not give strong emphasis to many of the relevant aspects of human relations in their courses. Moreover, considerably less emphasis is given to the problems of intergroup relations than to interpersonal relations. Professors in small colleges do not differ significantly from those in large universities with respect to what they believe and what they do about the various aspects of human relations education.

In general, professors of education teach human relations in the setting of both community and classroom. It is safe to assume, however, that they deal more frequently with the low social tension areas of age, sex, parent-child, and intelligence level groups. Sociologists, psychologists and anthropologists deal largely with relationships in the content of community and these more often have to do with the high social tension areas of race, religion and ethnic groups.

A considerable number of professors did not perceive omissions in the programs of teacher preparation. This presents a problem, for unless weakness is perceived, change in unlikely to occur.

Although all kinds of methods are used to teach human relations, the direct learning experiences which are most effective in changing attitudes, in developing sensitivity and in establishing values and skills were used by only a small percentage of the respondents. So, too, small use was reported of audio-visual aids, yet many fine films, video tapes, recordings, TV and radio programs are available.

Implications and Next Steps

This study provides some information and clues about the extent and status of the efforts of professors in a considerable number of colleges in the North Central Association area, to prepare prospective teachers with respect to problems of human relations, both interpersonal and intergroup, as they occur throughout life in the community, the school and the classroom. It shows that substantial numbers of professors do not give high importance to this aspect of teacher preparation and that many others who believe in its importance still do not emphasize it in their courses. This gives reason to believe that omissions exist, that in this respect programs of teacher education show weakness, and that many professors are unaware of the fact of omissions and weakness.

Inasmuch as the respondents were selected because their courses had highest relevance to the subject on their institutions, and because they responded in terms of the one course which had greatest relevance, it is reasonable to believe that responses of professors who did not participate would produce even more evidence of low concern and activity in regard to these educational objectives. Although the survey does not reveal the entire problem, the data confirms the suspicions that there is a real problem and raises a question as to what can be done about it.

The implications of the findings present a picture that is rather uncomfortable. People tend to assume that teachers are being adequately prepared to deal with children as persons, to work with parents of all kinds, to understand community conditions which affect children's development and to promote in children the attitudes, values and skills which will help them to become adults able to experience generous, abundant living in the democratic tradition. Such seems not to be the case. It is possible that human relations education is short changed in teacher education curricula because there is a feeling that it is everybody's business. However, in some cases, what is everyone's business may be no one's business. In other situations, when some one person accepts responsibility, others wash their hands of it.

The best thought on the subject of human relations education is that it cannot be well done in a single course or seminar or workshop. Rather, it is something that needs to permeate an entire institution—beginning with top administration. It has to do with interpersonal relationships among faculty and with administrative and faculty concerns and activities in the community and on the campus. These attitudes and behaviors affect faculty and influence their relationships with students.

Interpersonal relationships among professors and administrators and individual interests in community affairs are unlikely of themselves to be enough to secure changes in curriculum. Consideration of what content and information should be included, and of what teaching methods should be used in helping students with the problems of human relations, needs to be undertaken cooperatively by all who are concerned.

The Committee, in reporting Project I, does not wish to level blame or responsibility for ignorance or prejudice or indifference on participating colleges, who share with all the other teacher education institutions a common and vital task. However, the people

of the nation depend upon them for future teachers who will be better informed, freer of prejudice, and more democratic. Upon those future teachers, in no small degree, depends the development of generations of people better able to handle their own personal relations, to solve the problems of intergroup relationships and to deal with international problems of vast importance to the world.

In this report, the Committee has identified some of the background factors. No one has as yet grappled at full length with the question, what can be done about it?

What, then, does the Committee suggest can be done?

1) Because there is lack of coordination, in each institution an administrator, president or dean, might see his way clear to arrange opportunities for people from the several disciplines and schools to have some conversations. These can well begin with talk about this report. Among the questions which need to be explored is whether or not human relations education *is* a function of the school. Should schools concentrate on intellectual matters leaving human relations to the home and community? Or, is human relations instrumental to learning and using knowledge? In what ways does it affect a child's ability to learn anything at any given time?

2) The second step is one of reflective analysis by every professor of his own purposes and examination of his own teaching activities.

3) Pooling of information about the many courses should lead to general perception of omissions, and to planning for whatever activities are to follow as the total college moves toward developing a more complete program of teacher education in human relations with respect to both the low and the high social tension areas.

4) Investigation of students should accompany "2" and "3"—what do they not know, what are their prevailing stereotypes and what are their attitudes and values about age groups, sex, parent relationships, race, religion, economic backgrounds and social class? Such study will need to include plans for finding out what changes college study and life actually make in students during the course of four years.

5) Although professors themselves do not rely solely on textbooks, those books upon which students lean heavily will need to be examined for the truthfulness with which they picture American history and American life with respect to minority groups, intergroup relations and the problems of living in our society.

6) Many ways of imparting information, of changing attitudes and of developing values need to be tried and tested for their effectiveness in uncovering tendencies to use stereotypic thinking, to harbor latent and overt prejudices and to use the instruments of discrimination. Verbal activities such as those involved in lecturing and discussion cannot alone be expected to accomplish the necessary educational purposes. Vicarious experiences through the use of films, radio and TV and direct experiences through an action program of supervised learning experiences are essential when dealing with attitudes and values and skills.

The Committee suggests that the findings of this study be directed to the Committee on the Studies of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. In the analysis of the data and discussion of the meaning of the report, the question has been raised as to whether the Committee on Standards of the National Council on Accrediting of Teacher Education should include among the standards a minimum of general education which would include emphasis on the information, skills, attitudes and values of human relations.

APPENDIX I

TABLE I

TYPE OF OBJECTIVE DEEMED IMPORTANT FOR TEACHING RELATIONS

Objective	Percent of Respondents Indicating Objective
Attitudes, Values, Sensitivities	62.3%
Content, Information	46.6%
Skills, Techniques	23.9%
Topic not covered	20.7%

TABLE II

EXTENT TO WHICH OBJECTIVE OF SKILL AND TECHNIQUE IS DEEMED IMPORTANT

Areas of Human Relation	Percent of Respondents Listing Skil and Technique as an Objective
1. Information and understanding of relations between groups or individuals in the community	20.2%
2. Information and understanding of relations between the teacher and those with whom she works	31.8%
3. Information and understanding of relations between pupils in the classroom who have different characteristics or backgrounds	23.1%

TABLE III

TYPE OF OBJECTIVES DEEMED IMPORTANT FOR VARIOUS HUMAN RELATIONS AREAS

Areas of Human Relations	Percentage of Respondents Indicating Objective				
	Content and Information	Skills and Techniques	Attitudes, Values	Topic not Covered	No Response
High Involvement Areas—(religious, racial, economic, and nationality differences)	41.6	13.0	63.7	22.0	4.0
Low Involvement Areas—(such as age groups, parent-child, boy-girl, intellectual performance)	48.2	30.5	62.3	19.9	4.0

TABLE IV

EMPHASIS GIVEN TO ITEMS OF HUMAN RELATIONS

		Important	Some	None	No. Ans.	Total
COMMUNITY	Information & Understanding between					
	Age groups	38	45	14	3	100
	Children the same age	45	30	22	3	100
	Parent and child	39	42	16	3	100
	The sexes	32	48	17	3	100
	Different educational levels	37	49	12	3	101
	Religious groups	21	48	28	2	99
	Racial groups	31	49	18	2	100
	Economic groups	31	45	22	2	100
	Nationality groups	21	49	27	3	100
SCHOOL SYSTEM	Information & Understanding between the teacher and					
	Self	53	27	17	3	100
	Pupils	63	18	17	2	100
	Parents of pupils	34	41	23	2	100
	Supervisor	30	34	33	3	100
	Colleagues	32	40	25	3	100
CLASSROOM	Information & Understanding between pupils who are of different					
	Sex	30	43	24	3	100
	Intellectual performance levels	52	29	17	2	100
	Socio-emotional development	53	28	16	2	99
	Physical development	30	39	28	3	100
	Religious background	16	49	33	2	100
	Racial background	20	54	24	2	100
	Economic background	22	58	17	2	99
	Nationality background	16	52	29	2	99

TABLE V

DEPARMENTAL EMPHASIS ON AREAS OF HUMAN RELATIONS

	Community			School System			Classroom			Total (Average)		
Department	Important Emphasis	Some Emphasis	No Emphasis	Important Emphasis	Some Emphasis	No Emphasis	Important Emphasis	Some Emphasis	No Emphasis	Important Emphasis	Some Emphasis	No Emphasis
Education	33	47	17	60	33	6	36	48	14	40	44	14
Soc., Psych., Anthro.	38	44	16	18	33	44	25	46	25	29	42	26
Other Social Sciences	28	42	26	11	28	54	15	35	45	20	37	39
Other	29	42	28	34	32	31	26	38	35	29	38	31

TABLE VI

DIFFERENT IDEAS ABOUT IMPORTANCE AND EMPHASIS

Who is Teaching	Highly Important for Future as Person and Teacher	Give Strong Emphasis in My Teaching	Some Importance for Future as Person and Teacher	Give Some Emphasis in My Teaching	No Importance	No Emphasis.
1. *Educators* About racial differences	54	17	40	63	4	20
About intellectual differences	53	74	45	21	0	4
2. *Sociologists* and *Anthroplogists* About racial differences	67	30	31	50	0	15
About intellectual differences	49	11	44	47	2	38
3. *History, Economics, Political Science* About racial differences	57	14	28	43	3	37
About intellectual differences	46	15	39	35	3	43

TABLE VII

DEPARTMENTAL EMPHASIS ON RELIGIOUS GROUP RELATIONS IN THE COMMUNITY

Department		Percentage of Respondents Reporting at Least "Some" Emphasis
Education	N=587	52%
Sociology, Anthropology	N=112	91%
Psychology	N=49	92%
Other Social Sciences	N=150	67%

TABLE VIII

DEPARTMENTAL ATTITUDES AS TO IMPORTANCE AND EMPHASIS

Department	Important for Teaching	At Least "Some" Emphasis
Controversial Areas		
Education	82	73
Soc., Psych., Anthro.	85	79
Other Social Sciences	71	74
Other	76	64
Non-Controversial Areas		
Education	95	91
Soc., Psych., Anthro.	90	77
Other Social Sciences	81	48
Other	86	72

TABLE IX

REASONS FOR OMISSIONS IN CURRICULUM

	Topic	Subject Matter not Adequately Developed	Assume Material is Covered Elsewhere	Lack of Time	Requires Special Training	Other
COMMUNITY	Age groups	13%	8%	12%	9%	6%
	Children same age	8	8	10	6	4
	Parent-child	13	10	14	10	6
	The sexes	12	10	10	12	6
	Diff. educ. levels	14	9	12	9	6
	Religious groups	15	9	14	15	8
	Racial groups	15	10	14	14	10
	Economic groups	14	10	15	13	7
	Nationality groups	13	10	15	13	7
	Other	2	1	2	2	1
SCHOOL SYSTEM	Self	13	9	11	12	5
	Pupils	9	8	10	8	4
	Parents of pupils	14	10	13	9	5
	Supervisor	9	8	12	7	4
	Colleagues	10	8	11	7	4
	Other	1	1	1	1	—
CLASSROOM	Sex	11	9	9	10	5
	Intell. perf. level	12	8	10	9	4
	Socio-emotional dev.	13	8	11	13	4
	Physical development	7	7	9	8	3
	Religious background	13	9	13	14	6
	Racial background	15	10	12	13	7
	Economic background	12	9	12	12	6
	Nationality background	12	9	12	11	6
	Other	1	1	1	1	1

Totals do not add to 100% because more than one choice was permitted.

TABLE X

PERCEIVED OMISSIONS IN THE CURRICULUM BY DEPARTMENT

Department	Areas of Human Relations							
	Community		School System		Classroom		All Items	
			Existence of Gaps					
	No	Don't know	No	Don't know	No	Don't know	No	Don't know
Education	22	26	28	23	26	26	25	25
Soc., Psych., Anthro.	10	47	11	55	12	49	11	50
Other Social Sciences	12	41	15	47	43	13	13	43
Other	17	35	23	42	16	41	18	30

TABLE XI

METHODS USED TO TEACH HUMAN RELATIONS

	Topic	Formal Lecture	Class Discussion	Outside Resource Persons	Small-group Activity	Observation in Field Situation
COMMUNITY	Age groups	45%	67%	14%	19%	30%
	Children same age	39	59	13	20	33
	Parent-child	43	62	14	16	16
	The sexes	45	63	10	16	22
	Diff. educ. levels	49	65	14	17	28
	Religious groups	42	57	14	11	13
	Racial groups	46	62	14	13	17
	Economic groups	47	63	12	12	17
	Nationality groups	40	53	10	9	13
	Other	8	9	3	2	3
SCHOOL SYSTEMS	Self	43	57	11	17	16
	Pupils	46	63	15	24	32
	Parents of pupils	39	55	11	14	13
	Supervisor	30	46	13	12	16
	Colleagues	32	49	11	16	16
	Other	5	4	2	2	2
CLASSROOM	Sex	42	58	10	16	26
	Intell. perf. level	29	63	12	21	31
	Socio-emotional dev.	47	65	14	21	30
	Physical development	39	54	8	15	26
	Religious background	36	53	9	11	12
	Racial background	40	58	10	12	15
	Economic background	43	62	10	12	18
	Nationality background	36	53	9	11	14
	Other	4	3	1	1	2

TABLE XI (Continued)

Active Field Project	Preparation of Papers on Topic	Practice Teaching	Conferences with Student	Topic Not Covered at All	Other Method	Not Ascertained
13%	22%	22%	23%	14%	5%	6%
13	21	26	24	21	6	6
8	19	17	19	15	7	6
8	18	20	19	14	5	6
11	21	22	20	11	4	6
5	18	11	15	21	5	6
6	20	14	17	15	4	6
7	18	15	14	14	4	6
4	16	12	13	21	3	9
2	4	1	2	—	2	90
7	17	20	30	17	4	7
12	25	28	29	16	6	6
6	14	18	20	21	5	8
5	10	22	20	30	2	8
5	8	21	20	26	3	8
1	2	1	2	—	1	92
8	17	22	20	20	3	8
12	23	26	24	14	4	6
10	23	24	24	14	4	6
8	15	22	18	23	3	8
5	13	13	16	25	2	7
6	16	15	17	20	3	7
7	15	17	18	17	3	7
5	13	14	16	25	3	8
1	2	1	2	1	1	94

Totals do not add to 100% because more than one choice was permitted.

APPENDIX II

REPORTS OF GOOD PRACTICES

The following brief descriptions are of colleges and universities in various parts of the nation. Some of them are outside of the NCA region.

College Conferences on Human Relations

A Faculty Conference

College conferences have taken several forms. In one state, after class work had ended, professors from the various colleges which comprise the state university, assembled at one college for a week-long conference on "Understanding and Improving Intergroup Relations." The opening address was made by the president of the university. The program for each day provided a general session with a major address and two discussion sessions for which participants were divided into small groups. In the evenings the group saw relevant films, took a trip into the community and enjoyed social hours. The content of the conference included identification of intergroup relations as a major problem, factors and conditions which affect intergroup relations, ways of changing attitudes and behaviors, campus action programs, and the teacher's role in intergroup relations.

A Campus Seminar

In another college where curriculum revision provided for a two-week period between two 15-week semesters, a two-week seminar on human understanding was offered. Its objective was ". . . to promote within the participants the attitude which opposes destructive intergroup conflict, and results in efforts to reduce such conflicts as are subject to human alleviation."

The dean of instruction assumed responsibility as chairman of the seminar. He was assisted by a five-man steering committee. All faculty members were involved as resource persons and participants. All students participated in the general sessions and in small study groups. Stimulating speakers were engaged for general sessions; a library of books and pamphlets was provided; films, discs and tapes were made available. Morning, afternoon and evening sessions were organized for every day. Pre- and post-testing provided data for evaluation.

The Human Relations Center

A number of colleges and universities have established Human Relations Centers. They vary in staff, organization, objectives and activities. One has been selected for description here. Established through a foundation grant, it is called "The Community Tensions Center." From its inception it had been directed by a sociologist. After the three-year grant expired, the college assumed financial responsibility for the maintenance of the Center and its continuation.

This Center functions in several specific areas. It offers a variety of regular courses in the field of intergroup relations. On occasion, it offers specific courses for such organizations as a community group, a police body or a professional social work group.

Through a variety of either foundation or locally subsidized grants, it undertakes particular research projects. These may be in the nature of publications, proceedings of a conference, or original empirical research.

A wide variety of community services is offered in the intergroup relations field by the Center. These include speaking engagements, public appearances, provision of consultant services and analytic procedures for community groups involved either directly or indirectly in the intergroup relations field.

This Center also functions as a source of information and service for the college campus. For example, outside experts from agencies in the field are brought in to meet with faculty people and discuss curriculum revision in the various disciplines and new developments on college campuses in intergroup relations, and to serve as consultants to classes in intergroup relations held within the Center's structure.

Summer Workshops

Every summer from fifty to sixty colleges and universities offer workshops in human relations. Participants, for the most part, are school principals, supervisors, teachers and counselors. Among others who attend in smaller numbers are policemen, social workers, PTA officers, college deans, and lay citizens. Efforts are made to have representation from a variety of races, religious and ethnic groups. Community agencies working in the area of human relations provide subventions, assist in recruitment of participants, offer scholarships, secure directors, consultants and resource persons and provide printed and audio-visual materials for the workshop.

A workshop, to be effective, must deal with the problems and concerns of its participants. These dictate the content to be studied. Learning activities planned cooperatively by staff and workshop members usually include reading of books and pamphlets, viewing and discussing films, using discs and tapes as discussion starters, working with consultants, listening to speakers, and subgroup work which includes planning, mobilizing facts, pooling and reporting. The groups usually take trips into the community, have opportunities to meet and work across group lines, and ask for individual conferences with staff members.

Some Human Relations Workshops are of one, two or three weeks duration. Work sessions may be half days or full days. Some workshops are "live-in" experiences. The content of the short workshops usually deals largely with intergroup relations: race,

religion, prejudice, the areas of discrimination, values, attitudes, and skills. Longer workshops, which may last five or six weeks, include interpersonal relations.

Field Experiences

Most of the curricula for teacher education include field projects. Usually these give students opportunities to lead groups of children in community or neighborhood recreational activities. They include youth groups such as Boy Scouts, church groups, groups organized for study or art work in community centers or settlement houses, hiking and skating clubs and other activity groups. In the best programs, the directors make attempts to get for the students experiences with groups of children different from themselves in race, religion, or social class. Students then discuss in class the problems of intergroup relations which confront them in working with the children. Reading on the subject follows.

In some teacher education colleges, classes are taken on trips into the community to see how life is lived and to talk with people. These learning experiences include vists to slum areas and housing projects, to large businesses and industries, to various churches and community agencies. Professors provide opportunities for students to express their stereotypes and prejudices before undertaking such trips, and to discuss the experiences on returning to class. Supplementary reading is recommended.

Use of this Report in a Faculty Meeting

Chairman—The President, a Dean, a Department Head
Participants—A cross-section of the departments of the schools of education and liberal arts
Materials—Copies of this report
Presentation of the report by an interested faculty member
Reactions—A panel consisting of a sociologist, an educator, an anthropologist and a psychologist
General Discussion—Application of findings to existing courses and practices in the institution
Summary—Where do we go from here?

APPENDIX III

Some Available Materials

BOOKS

Civil Liberties and Civil Rights

American Council on Education, The Function of the Public Schools in Dealing with Religion. Washington. D. C., The Council, 1953. 145p.

Konvitz, M. R., The Constitution and Civil Rights. New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1947. 254p.

Pfeffer, Leo, Church, State, and Freedom. Boston, Beacon Press, 1953. 675p.

Prejudice

Allport, Gordon W., Nature of Prejudice. Mass., Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954. 537p.

Clark, K. B., Prejudice and Your Child. Boston, Beacon Press, 1955. 151p.

Lee, A. M., Fraternities without Brotherhood; A Study of Prejudice on the American Campus. Boston, Beacon Press, 1955. 159p.

Simpson, G. E., and Yinger, J. M., Racial and Cultural Minorities; An Analysis of Prejudice and Discrimination. New York, Harper, 1953. 773p.

Race

Goodman, Mary E., Race Awareness in Young Children. Cambridge, Mass., Addison-Wesley Press, 1952. 280p.

Laurenti, Luigi, Property Values and Race. Berkeley, Calif., Univ. of Calif., 1960. 256p.

McEntire, Davis, Residence and Race. Univ. Calif. Press, 1960. 490p.

Montagu, Ashley M. F., Man's Most Dangerous Myth; The Fallacy of Race. 3d ed., rev. and enl. New York, Harper, 1952. 362p.

UNESCO, Race Question in Modern Science. New York, Whiteside, 1956. 373p.

Intergroup Education

Kilpatrick, William H. and Van Til, William, Intercultural Attitudes in the Making. New York, Harper, 1947. Ninth yrbk. of John Dewey Soc., 246p.

Pfeffer, Leo. Creeds in Competition. New York, Harper, 1958. 176p.

Taba, Hilda, et al., Diagnosing Human Relations Needs. Washington, American Council on Education, 1951. 155p.

Trager, Helen G., and Yarrow, Marian R., They Learn What They Live; Prejudice in Young Children. New York, Harper, 1952. 392p.

Discrimination

Abrams, Charles, Forbidden Neighbors: A Study of Prejudice in Housing. New York, Harper, 1955. 404p.

Belth, Nathan C. with Braverman, Harold and Puner, Morton, Barriers: Patterns of Discrimination Against Jews. New York, ADL, Friendly House Publications, 1958. 121p.

Glazer, Nathan and Davis, McEntire, STUDIES IN HOUSING AND MINORITY GROUPS. U. of Calif. Press, 1960.

Hill, Herbert and Greenberg, Jack, CITIZEN'S GUIDE TO DESEGREGATION; A Study of Social and Legal Change in American Life. Boston, Beacon Press, 1955. 185p.

Rose, Arnold M., THE NEGRO IN AMERICA, Boston, Beacon Press, 1956. 325p.

Ruchames, Louis, RACE, JOBS, AND POLITICS; The Story of FEPC. New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1953. 255p.

Williams, R. M., Jr., and Ryan, Margaret W. eds., SCHOOLS IN TRANSITION; Community Experiences in Desegregation. Chapel Hill, N. C., Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1954. 272p.

Intergroup Relations

Bendix, Reinhard and Lipset, Seymour Martin, eds., CLASS, STATUS AND POWER; A Reader in Social Stratification. Glencoe, Illinois, 1953. 725p.

Dean, John P. and Rosen, Alex, A MANUAL OF INTERGROUP RELATIONS. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1955. 194p.

Forster, Arnold, and Epstein, B. R., CROSS-CURRENTS. Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday, 1956. 382p.

Suchman, Edward A., Dean, John P. and Williams, Robin M., DESEGREGATION: Some Propositions and Research Suggestions. New York, ADL, 1958. 128p.

Immigration

Brown, F. J., and Roucek, J. S., eds., ONE AMERICA; The History, Contributions, and Present Problems of our Racial and National Minorities. 3d ed. New York, Prentice-Hall, 1952. 764p.

Handlin, Oscar, THE UPROOTED; The Epic Story of the Great Migration That Made the American People. Boston, Little Brown, 1951. 310p.

Family Relations

Ginzberg, Eli, ed., THE FAMILY AND SOCIAL CHANGE. New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1960.

Interpersonal Relations

COMMISSION ON "STAFF RELATIONS IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION." Washington, D. C., American Association of School Administrators, 1955.

Culbertson, et al., ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS: A CASE BOOK. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

Giselle, Ilg and Ames, YOUTH: The Years from Ten to Sixteen. New York, Harper & Bros., 1956.

National Institute of Mental Health, THE TEACHER AND MENTAL HEALTH, #385. Washington, D. C., U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, 1959.

Community Relations

Jones and Stout, SCHOOL PUBLIC RELATIONS. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1960.

Values

COMMITTEE ON "THE FUNCTION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL IN DEALING WITH RELIGION." Washington, D. C., American Council on Education, 1953.

Davis, Allison, SOCIAL CLASS INFLUENCES ON LEARNING. Mass., Harvard Univ. Press, 1948.

Hartford, E. F., MORAL VALUES IN PUBLIC EDUCATION. New York, Harper and Bros., 1958.

Hollingshead, A. B., ELMTOWN'S YOUTH. New York, Wiley, 1959.

Rasey and Menge, WHAT WE LEARN FROM CHILDREN. New York 16, Harper & Bros,. 1956.

Thelen, Herbert A., EDUCATION AND THE HUMAN QUEST. New York 16, Harper & Bros., 1960.

Warner, Meeker & Eells, SOCIAL CLASS IN AMERICA. New York, Harper & Bros., 1960.

General

Cook and Cook, SCHOOL PROBLEMS IN HUMAN RELATIONS. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1957.

Havighurst and Neugarten, SOCIETY AND EDUCATION. Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1957.

Montagu, Ashley, EDUCATION AND HUMAN RELATIONS. New York, Grove Press, Inc., 1958.

Murphy, Gardner, HUMAN POTENTIALITIES. New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1958.

———, MENTAL HEALTH AND HUMAN RELATIONS IN EDUCATION. New York, Harper & Bros., 1959.

PAMPHLETS

(Available from the national and regional offices of the Anti-Defamation League)

Prejudice

Allport, Gordon W. ABC'S OF SCAPEGOATING.

Benne, Bradford and Lippitt, GROUP DYNAMICS AND SOCIAL ACTION.

Handlin, Oscar and Mary, DANGER IN DISCORD.

Lee, Irving J., HOW DO YOU TALK ABOUT PEOPLE?

Overstreet, Bonaro W., THE RESPONSIBILITY IS OURS.

Raab, Earl and Lipset, Seymour M., PREJUDICE AND SOCIETY.

Taft, Charles P., PREJUDICE AND POLITICS.

Van Til, William, PREJUDICED—HOW DO PEOPLE GET THAT WAY?

Discrimination

Belth, N. C. and Epstein, Benjamin R., THE DIMENSIONS OF SOCIAL DISCRIMINATION.

Grier, George and Eunice, DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING: A Handbook of Facts.

Higham, John, SOCIAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST JEWS IN AMERICA, 1830–1930 (from the Publication of the American Jewish Historical Society).

FEPC AND THE COST OF DISCRIMINATION.

PLEASE ATTACH PHOTOGRAPHS.

Desegregation

Hansen, Carl F., MIRACLE OF SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT: Desegregation in the Washington, D. C. Schools.

North, Robert D., INTELLIGENCE OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO: A Research Report.

Tumin, Melvin M., ed., SEGREGATION AND DESEGREGATION: A Digest of Recent Research.

THE ROLE OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN DESEGREGATION: A Symposium.

Race

Alpenfels, Ethel J., SENSE AND NONSENSE ABOUT RACE.
Montagu, Ashley, WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT "RACE."
UNESCO, RACE.

Culture Groups

Handlin, Oscar, AMERICAN JEWS: THEIR STORY.
Kennedy, John F., A NATION OF IMMIGRANTS.
Senior, Clarence, STRANGERS—THEN NEIGHBORS: From Pilgrims to Puerto Ricans.

FILMS

(Available from the national and regional offices of the Anti-Defamation League)

ALL THE WAY HOME—29½ minutes
Concerns the problem of new and different neighbors.

AN AMERICAN GIRL—29½ minutes
Describes the results of irrational and unsocial prejudice.

THE BOOK AND THE IDOL—14½ minutes
Traces emergence of monotheism in the Judeo-Christian heritage.

BOUNDARY LINES—11½ minutes
Lines that separate people have no basis in reality.

CRISIS IN LEVITTOWN—31½ minutes
Dr. Dan Dodson interviews Levittown, Pa. residents when a Negro family moves in.

CHALLENGE TO AMERICA—25 minutes
Dr. William Van Til discusses the importance and techniques of intercultural education.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN AMERICA—25 minutes
Dr. Melvin Tumin traces the psycho, history, manifestations of and remedies for anti-Semitism.

THE HIGH WALL—30 minutes
Describes the nature and genesis of prejudice.

TRAGEDY IN A TEMPORARY TOWN—47½ minutes
What occurs in a construction workers camp when a rumor runs rife.

THE FEELING OF REJECTION—30 minutes—McGraw-Hill
Traces psychosomatic illness to childhood experiences.

THE FEELING OF HOSTILITY—30 minutes—McGraw-Hill
Shows a brilliant girl who, because of childhood experiences, is unable to relate to others with warmth.